

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/773,072	02/04/2004	Brent T. Toland	12-1203	6032		
Connie M. The	7590 10/01/200 ousand	EXAM	EXAMINER			
Northrop Grumman Space & Mission Systems Corp.			PUENTE	PUENTE, EVA YI		
One Space Park Bldg, E1/2041 Redondo Beach, CA 90278			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2611			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			10/01/2008	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/773,072	TOLAND ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
EVA Y. PUENTE	2611		

	EVA Y. PUENTE	2611					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 18 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FIT	ED WITHIN TW				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period act under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They raise the desired to be a the control of t	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving.		be entered and an e	planation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	the face and the data of fire a blo						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
/Chieh M Fan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant amended paragraph [0006] and [0016] of original specification to overcome lack of enablement 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection in Final Office Action. However, such amendment histoduces new matter and the disclosure of the invention. To overcome a prima facic case of lack of enablement, applicant must demonstrate by argument and/or evidence that the disclosure, as filed, would have enabled the claimed invention for one skilled in the art at the time of filing. (Please see MPEP § 2164 - § 2164.08(c)). Thus, deleting "carrier" from paragraph [0006] and [0016] of original specification introduces new matter and not entered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant proclaims limitations in claims 4 and 10 are canceled to overcome lack of enablement 55 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection in Finial Office Action flowards, page 7, paragraph 4). However, applicant merely combined the claimed subject matters of claims 4 and 10 with independent claims 1 and 7, respectively. No limitations were cancelled. Upon review applicants arguments, it is still unclear how UWB generate different frequencies for different users. Paragraph 13 and 14 of the specification are directed to beam steering embodiment of applicants' invention (Fig. 1 and 2). It is unrelated to frequency reuse (Fig. 4) and does not explain subject matters claimed in claims 4 and 10. As indicated in Final Office Action, there's no detailed description of how the UWB frequencies are controlled. Therefore, Examiner's reiection is maintained.